



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INTERNATIONALISM.

BY JAMES H. MAYS.

The nation is composed of individuals, as the mass is composed of atoms. In the beautiful discovery of Newton, we learn that the same law which governs the smallest atom, governs also the largest mass, even to the universe of planets and suns. Individuals, bound in fellowship by one great rule of right, consent to have the fierceness of their nature restrained for the common welfare. They are constrained to live with common purposes, strive for common advancement, rejoice in common blessings, suffer common disasters; in common they glory in mutual happiness, and in the victories of peace, "no less renowned than war." So nations, after squandering their resources upon the art of destruction, after ages of dreadful warfare, are likewise coming to realize the awful folly of continual discord. They, too, are beginning to appreciate the significance of moral laws; to beware lest they disregard the divine command, "Love thy neighbor as thyself;" to observe the same great rule of right that binds individuals in fellowship.

This growing spirit of mutual helpfulness we call Internationalism. What is the origin, the development, the mission of this bond of fellowship among the nations?

I. With our savage forefathers, the family was the nation. Apart from actual kinship, there was no brotherhood. Every man outside this petty circle was an enemy to be slain as the wild beast of the jungles. Beginning to realize the strength of united action, families formed into tribes under chiefs to wage more relentless warfare upon all other tribes. As the rays of civilization penetrated deeper into the gloom, these tribes, stirred by the same restless energy, united into larger communities and settled upon fixed habitations. Land, instead of kinship, became the basis of society, and was occupied by petty lordships and communities, separate and distinct. At first they professed no common interest, cultivated no friendly relations, recognized no rights claimed by members of other communities, and treated all men outside the narrow limits of their province as enemies. Each held it to be the great aim of life to carry on successful warfare, and zealously maintained, as do nations now, the right to make war on every other community. Their association was for mutual destruction. Every principality was intolerant, bigoted, selfish. Within their own border lines, the people were enjoined to recognize the brotherhood of man; outside these limits, they were licensed and encouraged to pilfer and murder without restraint. Within their borders, they lived in harmony; outside, they roamed the seas as pirates, ravaged the land as bandits, annihilated villages, gave no quarter, sparing not even women or children. It was one continuous story of dreadful warfare from the time

"When man walked with beast,
Joint tenant of the shade."

Gradually it dawned upon the minds of men that there was nothing in political lines to make them foes; they began to realize that they were men, who had much in common. They said one to another, "we will further unite for common defence and mutual advancement." Just as the smaller bodies by degrees had been drawn into fellowship, these larger bodies were fused into nations. Primitive Rome was formed by the union of small communities. The countless principalities of Great Britain were gradually merged into seven kingdoms, and then united into one *great* kingdom under Egbert, the Saxon. In France we see Roman, Iberian, Teuton and Celt, once stirred by angry passions, now blended into a powerful republic. Spain, a composite of numerous races of different religion and government, became a nation in the fifteenth century by the union of Castile and Aragon. Germany, once consisting of more than three hundred distinct principalities, each in bloody strife with the others, now presents a mighty empire, united at home and respected abroad. And on this side the seas, many great states, inclined at first to be indifferent to the common weal, disposed to be independent sovereignties, united their interests, and to-day present a typical example of what brotherly spirit may do for the nations of the world. Thus, with the gradual association of tribes and communities, great nations were formed, each invoking the blessings of united friendly action upon its numerous principalities. The torch of the incendiary was extinguished, the license of the robber revoked, the red hand of the assassin arrested, the mad fury of the mob restrained, and the once hostile factions were welded into great nations.

II. Such was the result of the fellowship of communities. Consider the development of this spirit among nations. Internally, each rejoiced in the mutual friendship of its numerous provinces; but strange to say, toward its neighbors, assumed a hostile front. This attitude of the nations caused Burke to declare that friendly international relations would afford a pleasing theme for the historian, but "alas! such history would not fill ten pages." These cordial relations between states of the modern world had their beginning in the Peace of Westphalia, which was confirmed by the principal nations of Europe. Permanent legations were then first securely established. Since then, says Emerson, "all history is the decline of war." Since then, says Sir Henry Maine, "a moral brotherhood in the whole human race has been steadily gaining ground." Twenty years ago, Gladstone declared that there had been reserved for England a great and honorable destiny in promoting internationalism. Since these words were spoken, thirty-eight powerful nations have united their moral forces, by the treaty of Geneva, as a safeguard against the excesses, miseries, and ferocities of war. They have bound themselves to use every means to relieve the suffering of sick and

wounded soldiers; to discourage war, as the best means of attaining that end; to encourage international good will; to mitigate international calamities in time of peace; and to place international concord on a more enduring basis.

This spirit of mutual fellowship is fast pervading all human society. From the family circle to the tribal community, from the village clan to the broader province, from jealous statehood to national commonwealth, the great rule of right is becoming broad enough and strong enough to embrace all mankind in the general harmony. In recognition of this unity of interest the Pan-American congress assembled at Washington with the highest motives that ever actuated international movements. Representatives of half the civilized world met, not to arouse bitter prejudices, but for better mutual understanding; not to obtain unfair advantages, but to promote the general welfare; not to cultivate the art and terrible amusement of war, but to form closer commercial relations; not to witness the parade of military forces, but to obviate all necessity for the maintenance of navies and great standing armies, such as are now crushing out the life of Europe. Let those who would sneer at the growing spirit of internationalism, remember that never before did there convene a congress of nations with the common purpose of agreeing, not upon military plans, not to incite their people to tumult and carnage, not to foster cruelty and superstition, not to do homage to the God of Battles, but to adopt the motto of peace and fellowship, and thus secure enduring prosperity in the western world.

III. Brief as has been the history of these great movements, certain principles and methods have been clearly defined. What, then, is the mission of internationalism? Though slow in development, its spirit has long been appealing to the better nature of the individual man, and is now beginning to pervade the councils of nations. What is there in boundary lines to convert a brother-man into a deadly foe? Ought the conduct of nation toward nation to be less humane than that of man toward man? Shall nations still retain barbarous methods of determining justice, while judicial tribunals by exercise of reason adjudicate the rights of individuals? Shall we execute a man for committing a single murder, and glorify a nation for slaughtering its thousands? Is that voice of thunder, "Thou shalt not kill," prolonged and re-echoed throughout the earth by Christian churches, to have an awful meaning to individuals, and signify nothing to nations? By what reasoning can the crime of the individual become the glory of the nation? Must man put forth every energy against pestilence and famine, while nations upon the slightest pretext "let slip the dogs of war"? Must he revere and cherish his religion, and yet allow the state to profane it? Must he continue to extol virtue to the skies, and yet permit nations to dethrone it? Must he strive for knowledge, while nations misapply and

pervert it? Oh why must man continue to toil, and permit the product of his hand and brain to be squandered upon the means of destruction? If it has proved well for individuals, families, tribes, communities, and provinces to strive peaceably together, should not the larger masses of men profit by such example? It is the mission of internationalism to answer these questions, and to say to governments, into whose hands the welfare of mankind is placed:

"Therefore take heed
How you awake the sleeping sword of war;
In the name of God, take heed."

Man may yet be blinded by prejudice, nations may yet be lacerated by war, but of this we may be assured, that in the distresses which mankind must suffer, ignorance will never again be so potent a factor, for men are now heirs to the wisdom of the ages; difference in religion will never again so arouse the spirit of intolerance, for man must be left unfettered to obey the dictates of his conscience; difference in race and language will never again be so strong a barrier to friendly intercourse, for all nations are coming to recognize the brotherhood of man; distance will never again render international interests so vague and remote, for the messengers of intelligence and of commerce, like shuttles, are rushing to and fro over the earth, "weaving the nations into one." Stupendous political movements, which in times past, would have brought havoc and carnage, must in future be conducted through quiet deliberations. Questions, which a few years ago would have been sure heralds of war, must be determined before a supreme court of the nations. Already it is the law of nations to do in time of peace the most good and in time of war the least evil. Arbitration is the rule; and when war does occur, it is divested of its most atrocious cruelties. Nations begin to realize that disaster needs no aid or encouragement from the government; that humanity will suffer enough at best; that governments are the servants of men, and not their masters; that they are institutions for man's benefit, and not for his torture; that they are builders and not destroyers; that they are means to an end, and that end the advancement of civilization.

This, then, is the mission of internationalism; that the nations instead of imitating the fierceness of the tiger, shall render good offices one unto another; instead of rejoicing in the "pomp and circumstance of glorious war," shall tender support in public distress; instead of invading, bombarding and pillaging their neighbors, shall afford relief in general calamities; and that instead of the clank of arms and the cannon's roar, instead of the crash and jar of artillery, the tramp of the war horse, the glare of hungry flames, the pitiless scenes of death, decay and famine, we may behold the nations of the earth, of every religion, language and race, firmly bound by the threads of commerce and the stronger ties of brotherly feeling;

behold them flourishing together in the arts of peace, striving with common impulses, combined in common enterprises, and tendering mutual returns of kindness and civility.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

ADDRESS OF SIR JOSEPH W. PEASE, PRESIDENT, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE LONDON PEACE SOCIETY, MAY 21st.

I think we must all be perfectly satisfied with the abstract of the Report which has been read by the Secretary. I should also like to say that at a meeting that was held this morning, we all felt that the Secretary had drawn an exceedingly able report and narrative, not only of our own work, but also of those kindred Societies with whom we have so much pleasure in co-operating. When you see that Report in full, you will find paragraph after paragraph full of interest.

It is somewhat sad that we should meet here, year after year, and still have to lament, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, this enormous and ever-increasing expenditure, not only on our own part, but on the part of all the civilized and so-called Christian nations of Europe; the enormous waste in building ships that pass out of fashion and out of use in a far shorter term than even the short-lived life of the merchant vessel. Thousands and millions of pounds, in the course of a few years, are actually wasted, and the ships are never used.

Just look for a moment, not only on our own position, but at the position of some of our neighbors. Of all the transgressors against the peace of Europe, Louis Napoleon was the greatest; but surely retribution has fallen on the country that made him its President. The French allowed his ambition and that of his wife to bring them to their present condition, injuring not only neighboring nations, but even ourselves, in endeavoring to compete with her extravagant expenditure.

The Christian standard of Peace must be upheld by us. It was this, that our good friend Mr. Henry Richard used to proclaim, from year's end to year's end, that we should not lower the standard down to the standard of mere expediency, or political economy, both of which might be high standards, but that we should still keep to the higher tone that the Peace movement be part of the glad tidings of great joy that will be preached to all nations. However, whilst these expenditures have been increasing, Arbitrations have also been increasing. There is a long list of these in an excellent slip which is published by the Peace Society. In various instances, arbitrations have been successful during the short period since we met here together last year, which, under other circumstances, would have led to wars.

There is one paragraph of the Report which refers to the Diocese of Durham. The Bishop of Durham has given

us every possible assistance, and is to head a deputation to Lord Rosebery, if the Premier is well enough to receive it. The first thing the Bishop did, when he came into the Diocese, was to throw himself into an Arbitration, almost to make himself an Arbitrator, in a great trade dispute. He not only got that settled, but he insisted that a permanent Council of Conciliation should be formed, and when the lead of that Council could be agreed upon by both sides, then that the Board of Trade should step in and appoint an arbitrator. Both sides are now working amicably. I merely mention this as a justification of what we are constantly urging—that arbitration can settle disputes among nations. I believe it is a permanent tribunal which ought to be established, in order that before a dispute gets to any length, the good offices of such a tribunal may be at once called into operation.

There are other matters of congratulation in the Report, and one is in reference to the tone of the Press of our country generally. It has been more kindly towards us during the last two years. Instead of calling us “fanatics” and “Puritans,” they generally have given us a pat on the back and told us we all have the right thing at heart. We see nation after nation going down almost to bankruptcy. We see a kingdom like Italy groaning under over-taxation. I was in Italy a few weeks ago, and since I was there last, all the gold and silver coinage has passed away, and if you want to know what *filthy* lucre is, you have only to look at their *lire* (one shilling) notes issued by the Government. Another point worth noticing is that there is a constant accession of members not only to our Auxiliaries at home, but to the cognate Societies at work abroad.

There is another point which I have urged and have felt to be one of the most important points in the Report, and that is the co-operation of the Christian Churches; but we have them much more with us than we have ever had before. It is the Churches alone, I believe, which can make nations see the immorality of all war, and that war is contrary to the principles of the gospel of the Prince of Peace.

I think the words of our Chancellor of the Exchequer a few weeks ago, ought to be a warning to all. He could not withstand, and no government could withstand, the pressure to expend much more money on naval armaments. I regret some of us did not speak out more fully on the subject; but he warned us that we had a hundred millions of taxation, and that we had got about to the end of our taxation, and that if we go on with remedial measures in legislation, especially in education, and in the homes of the working classes, the only thing we can reduce and retrench is the armaments, for we cannot do it in education, or the civil wants of the people. I have advocated for years that we should set an example to the nations. If we had five or six ships less and spent less, I believe we should be safer than we are now. You may well impress upon your Representatives in Parliament, to do their best to get back to the old principles of retrenchment, and lead the way to those reforms which some of us believe to be absolutely necessary.